

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 219-223, 228, 232, 236, 238-242, 251, 257, 259, 260 and 262-267 and are in the application, of which Claim 219 is the independent claim. Claims 219, 236, 238, 251, 257, 260, 262, 264 and 266 are amended and claims 250 and 252-256 are newly canceled herein. No new claims have been added. No new matter is believed to have been introduced to the application by this paper. Entry hereof and early passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 228, 232, 238, 254, 255, 257 and 259 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if written in independent form.

Claim Rejections

Claims 219, 220, 223, 236, 239-242, 250-252, 260, 263 and 265 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sugaya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,210). Claims 221, 222 and 256 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugaya. Claims 253 and 264 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugaya in view of Neugebauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,066). Claim 262 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugaya in view of Fiagello et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,840,923). Claim 267 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugaya in view of Matsuo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,227). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 219 is directed to a chip package. The chip package includes a substrate and only one die having a top surface at a first horizontal level higher than a second horizontal level of a top surface of said substrate, wherein said substrate has no portion at said first horizontal level. The chip package further includes an adhesive material joining said top surface of said substrate and a bottom surface of said only one die. The chip package further includes a first insulating layer over said first horizontal level, said only one die and said substrate and across an edge of said only one die, wherein said first insulating layer comprises a first portion vertically over said

only one die and a second portion not vertically over said only one die. The chip package further includes a patterned circuit layer over said first insulating layer, said first horizontal level, said only one die and said substrate and across the edge, wherein said patterned circuit layer is connected to said only one die through a first opening in said first insulating layer. The chip package further includes an inductor over said first horizontal level and said first insulating layer, and a second insulating layer on said inductor.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or suggest the foregoing combination of features of amended Claim 219.

In this regard, Sugaya is seen to teach that a first mixture 1311, alleged as the claimed substrate, has a portion at a horizontal level, at which a top surface of a bare semiconductor chip 1301, alleged as the claimed only one die, is positioned. However, Sugaya is not seen to teach or suggest that the first mixture 1311, alleged as the claimed substrate, has no portion at a horizontal level, at which a top surface of the bare semiconductor chip 1301, alleged as the claimed only one die, is positioned. Accordingly, the feature of amended Claim 219 that “said substrate has no portion at said first horizontal level,” wherein at said first horizontal level is a top surface of said only one die, is not seen to be anticipated or suggested by Sugaya. The other remaining applied references are not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Sugaya.

Accordingly, Amended Claim 219 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 219 are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from Claim 219 discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

Application No. 10/055,568

Amendment dated January 24, 2011

Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2010

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the Amendments and Remarks herein, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a notice to this effect. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Dennis A. Duchene/
Dennis A. Duchene
Registration No. 40,595

11682 El Camino Real, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92130
Phone: 858.720.3300 DAD:tah
Facsimile: 858.720.7800
Date: January 24, 2011

**Please recognize our Customer No. 89518
as our correspondence address.**